

REMARKS

With claims 1, 3-4, and 6-16 pending, with this amendment, claims 3, 7, 8, 10, 12, 15 and 16 have been amended as discussed in detail below. Further the abstract and specification have been amended as detailed to follow.

Objection to Abstract

The Abstract stands objected to because it was not provided on a separate page in the Office Action filed 9/16/02. In response, Applicant has submitted the abstract on a separate page from other pages with this amendment.

Objections to Specification

The specification stands objected to because of various informalities indicated in the Office Action. Initially the specification is objected to because on page 2, line 20 it includes the hypertext link “<http://www.mapsonus.com>” which the Office Action states should be “mapsonus.com.” Further, the specification states that page 3, line 4 likewise includes a hypertext link. In response, Applicant has amended the text of pages 2 and 3 to remove the hypertext link as suggested.

The specification further stands objected to because on page 4, line 5, an attorney docket number is used to cite a copending application or patent. In response, applicant has amended the text on page 3 to recite the patent number for the now issued patent.

The specification further stands objected to because on page 5, line 6 and further on page 20, line 15 the text recites “Lat Longs.” The Office Action indicates these should be “Lat/Long.” In response, Applicant has amended pages 5 and 20 to read “Lat/Long.”

The specification further stands objected to because on page 8, lines 9 and 10 “1st St” should be recited as “First Street.” Further on page 8, line 11 the Office Action states that “19th” should be recited as “nineteenth.” In response, applicant notes that Fig. 1 includes a list of street names. Among these street names are shown “1st St.” and 19th Ave.” The specification repeats these names, referencing locations from Fig. 1. Although a general reference to 1st or 19th might be more properly referenced in the specification as “first” or “nineteenth,” using such terms would cause confusion by not complying with the street names listed in Fig. 1. Street names on a map are typically listed as 1st

Street, or 19th Avenue, as in Fig. 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objections to the terms 1st and 19th on page 8 be withdrawn.

The specification further stands objected to because on page 16, lines 11, 16 and 19, as well as on page 21 “½ way” and “¼” should be referenced as “half-way” and “one-fourth.” In response, Applicant has amended pages 16 and 21 to use the terms “half-way” and “one-fourth” as requested.

The specification further stands objected to because on page 23, line 9, the acronym “SCF” is used without indicating what it stands for. In response, page 23 has been amended to indicate that “SCF” stands for “Sectional Center Facility.”

The specification further stands objected to because on page 29, line 5, the acronym “rf” is used instead of “radio frequency (rf).” In response, Applicant has amended page 29 to use the term “radio frequency (rf).”

Based on the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Section 112, First Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as being non-enabling. The Office Action states that claims 1 and 3 recite “map database,” but the only mention of “map database” is on page 12, line 22. The Office Action continues to state that other portions of the specification reference “geocoded database” and “mapquest database.” The Office Action states it is unclear from the specification whether there are more than one database, or just one database for the invention. Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to replace the term “map database” with simply “database.” Database layers are described in the specification beginning on page 10, line 12. The database layering system indicates that different portions of a single database can be distinguished. Thus, the “geocoded database” referenced beginning on page 11, line 3, is believed to cover a single database. Accordingly, the term “database” is believed adequately described in the specification. The term “database” alone was used in the claims originally filed, such as claims 2 and 6. Thus, as amended, claims 1 and 3 are believed to be in condition for allowance under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 6, 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Based on the above amendments and the following remarks with respect to particular claims, this rejection is now believed overcome.

Initially the Office Action states that claim 12 in the last claim limitation recites "... to its endpoint," and inquires if Applicant means "to the radial's endpoint." In response, applicant has amended claim 12 to replace "its endpoint" with "said endpoint of the respective radial." This provides antecedent basis to the radial's endpoint referenced previously in the claim and is believed to clarify the claim language to assure it is referring to the radial's endpoint making the claim definite.

Regarding claim 6, the Office Action states that it recites "data item" in line 7, yet subsequent claims dependant on claim 6 recite "data items." In response, claims 7, 8 and 10 have been amended to recite the "at least one data item" to provide antecedent basis to the term of claim 6.

Regarding claim 15, the Office Action states that it recites "plurality of radials" and "data item" in the last line, yet subsequent claims dependant on claim 6 recite "the radials" and "data items." In response, claims 15 and 16 have been amended to recite the "at least one data item" and "the plurality of radials" to provide antecedent basis to the initial term in claim 15.

Thus, as amended, claims 6, 12 and 15 as well as their dependant claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, all of pending claims 1, 3-4, and 6-16 are believed in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 20, 2007

By: /Thomas A. Ward/
Thomas A. Ward
Reg. No. 35,732

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928